



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/523,919      | 02/07/2005  | Andreas Wolfert      | 264737US0PCT        | 1953             |

22850 7590 09/17/2010  
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

KATAKAM, SUDHAKAR

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1621

|                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-------------------|---------------|

09/17/2010

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com



## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Status of the application***

1. Receipt of Applicant's Remarks and Arguments filed on 18 Aug 2010 is acknowledged. However, the arguments for the 103(a) rejection are not found persuasive and as such, the previous rejection, made on 12 July 2010, for the claims has been maintained for the reasons of record in the office action dated 12 July 2010.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed on 18 Aug 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

*Applicants argue that the maximum pressure in any of the examples of **Biskup et al** is 820 mbar, which is substantially less than minimum pressure of more than 3 bar herein, and **Biskup et al** provides no motivation to employ a pressure in their feed pipes leading to their mixing aggregate of more than 3 bar, given the expected added expense in operating at an even higher pressure.*

**Biskup et al** teach that the pressure in the feed pipes leading to the mixing aggregate lies within the range of from 200 to 3000 mbar, and pressure of downstream of the condensation step lies within the range of from 150 to 2000 mbar [column 5, lines 12-16]. Therefore, the pressure of the reaction medium is expected to be in between in the pressure in the feed pipes and pressure of downstream of the condensation step.

All the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled person in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination would have yielded predictable results to

Art Unit: 1621

have yielded predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention. In this case, **Biskup et al** teach all elements of applicants' process, and the pressure difference is not a huge from the teachings of **Biskup et al**. In fact the upper end pressure range of **Biskup et al** overlaps with the lower end pressure range of instant claims. The claim would have been obvious because the design incentives or market forces provided a reason to make an adaptation, and the invention resulted from application of the prior knowledge in a predictable manner.

*Applicants argue that applying increased pressure leads to an increased space time yield and allows a production plant which contains very little phosgene.*

Applicants fail to provide sufficient information in the form of a comparative data to support their unexpected results with the closest prior art.

With regard to the newly added claims, again the difference is very small from the upper end pressure range of **Biskup et al**. However, the pressure conditions in the claimed range and the prior art range are close enough that one skilled in the art would expect them to have the same properties. See MPEP 2144.05 I., "[A] *prima facie* case of obviousness exists where the claimed ranges and prior art ranges do not overlap but are close enough that one skilled in the art would have expected them to have the same properties. *Titanium Metals Corp. of America v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 USPQ 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)".

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 1621

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

5. Claims 1-6 and 9-15 are again rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Biskup et al** (US 5,449,818) for the reasons of record set forth in the office action on 12 July 2010.

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136 (a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no even, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**Conclusion**

Art Unit: 1621

7. No claim is allowed.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sudhakar Katakam whose telephone number is 571-272-9929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Daniel Sullivan can be reached on 571-272-0779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sudhakar Katakam/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1621